



Design Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, March 24, 2022
via tele/videoconference

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

Members present: Chair Scott Kraehnke, Ryan O'Connor, Daryl Melzer, Larry Pachefsky, Mike Skauge, Wesley Brice, Bryan Koester, Lybra Loest, and Mary Wright.

Others present: Steve Lindner, Lauren Gordon-Fahn, Caleb Coslet, Joseph Lee, Jerry Wick, Joe Stanton and Building Inspector Justin Burris.

2. Approval of the March 10, 2022 meeting minutes.

Mr. Pachefsky moved to approve the minutes, as drafted; seconded by Mr. Koester. Vote 9-0.

3. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the elimination and modification of windows at residential property 4350 N. Marlborough Drive.

Steve Lindner of Lakeview Remodeling presented the plans detailing the proposed changes. The bay window on the East façade is being raised 6"-8" inches to allow for kitchen cabinets below. The window East of the side door on the North façade is being eliminated to allow for the installation of a new range. Lannon stone cladding will be replaced and toothed in to match existing. Board members discussed the plans.

Mr. Koester moved to approve the plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Skauge. Vote 9-0.

4. Consideration of the application and plans on file for the modification of siding (new material) and installation of awning over rear side door at residential property 4075-77 N. Stowell Avenue.

Caleb Coslet of Infinity Exteriors presented the plans for the siding renovation and new awning over the North façade side door. Caleb stated that the front entryway and 2nd floor sunroom area will remain stucco, and the remainder of the house will be resided with 6-7/8" LP Smart side, with a band board that wraps the house bisecting the double hung windows where the sashes meet. The existing windows/trim will remain in place, and will be painted prior to the siding being installed. Caleb explained that the awning over the door would have a pitched roof to mimic existing roof pitches, with arched "corbel" brackets and crown molding. Board members discussed the plans.

Mr. Melzer moved to approve the plans as submitted; seconded by Mr. Pachefsky. Vote 9-0.

5. Further consideration of the application and plans on file for a proposed multi-family re-development at commercial properties 2418, 2420 and 2428 E. Capitol Drive.

Mr. Lee presented the changes that were discussed during the last meeting, including the West façade ground floor, window & door height elevations, parapet heights, signage, hardscapes/green roof elements, and the East façade louver vent.

Chair Kraehnke opened the floor to the public for their comments and questions.

Ms. Anita Krier, property owner 2518-24 E. Capitol Dr., stated that she was concerned with the massive project on the corner, and that the lack of green space seemed inappropriate.

Mr. Ed Ruen, 4015 N. Stowell Ave., stated that he felt the neighbors should have been involved earlier in the process, and that the building could have been a model for the Village. He appreciated the opportunity for discussion, and felt that starting over on a complete redesign with the neighbors and developers working together was the best course of action. He stated he is opposed to the design, and hopes that something in keeping with the “spirit” of Shorewood can be designed and constructed.

Ms. Lauren Gordon-Fahn, 4075-77 N. Stowell Ave., commented on the green space and did not understand why this site was not held to the 30% minimum requirement. She stated that she believed a mixed-use of commercial and residential would be more fitting, and that a more park-like feel with additional green space would be beneficial for residents, and their dogs.

Mr. Daniel Walsh, 4024 N. Stowell Ave., stated he did not believe that this has been a collaborative effort. He stated that the single biggest issue is the massing, and that the building when complete, will appear significantly larger than surrounding homes and businesses. He stated that the landscaping was inadequate, that the Village requires a minimum of 30% grass, plantings and natural vegetation, and that this site provides less than 10%. He stated that the building is too large for the area, and should be scaled down to fit appropriately into the neighborhood.

Ms. Vicki Herman, 4071 N. Stowell Ave., stated that she was thankful for the change in color, that it is more in line with the neighborhood, and for moving the garage entrance onto the alley side of the building. Ms. Herman asked if a speed bump could be added to the alley to slow traffic exiting onto Stowell Ave.

Mr. Matthew Hietpas, 4062 N. Stowell Ave., stated he agrees with previously made statements that the building is too large for the area, and that there is not enough green space.

Ms. Andrea Brandt, 4054 N. Stowell Ave., stated she agrees with the neighbor’s comments, and questioned if anyone had consulted an arborist. She stated she believes the trees and plantings shown on the renderings would not survive in those locations. She stated that she did not care for the design.

Ms. Karen Desing, 3952 N. Stowell Ave., stated she believed the building was too large for the area.

Ms. Bill Desing, 3952 N. Stowell Ave., stated he believed the building was too large for the area. He questioned why the “green space” requirement was not applied to commercial properties, and he felt that the building should not be larger than three stories.

Chair Kraehnke addressed some of the comments made by the public, noting that he and the Board had received and reviewed the additional information provided by the public, and weighs their concerns as well.

He noted that the Zoning Code allows building in this District (B-3) of entirely residential use, and that any new building in this District must be a minimum of two stories. He also noted the code allows up to four stories and up to 60 feet in height, and that this building is proposed at 49 feet 6 inches in height, making only 85% of the total height it could be.

Chair Kraehnke noted that the section pertaining to the 30% “green space” is located in the beginning of the Chapter where the more general provisions are located, and that the specific provisions that pertain to the individual Districts conflict with the general provisions, and that the specific zoning district provisions take precedence. He also noted that the Plan Commission was in the process of reviewing a change to this ordinance as it has been identified by Village staff as needing to be updated.

Mr. Daniel Walsh, 4024 N. Stowell Ave., stated that because of the Special Exception for parking that the project received, the building could not have otherwise been constructed this large. He noted the Special Exception was granted without notice to the neighbors, and that no other community in the metropolitan area would have granted an exception such as this without first seeing the proposed development.

Ms. Lauren Gordon-Fahn, 4075-77 N. Stowell Ave., commented that a friend told her that their rights [the neighbors] would be upheld by this Board, the Design Review Board, and that considerations should be made to ensure this project matches the vibration of the rest of the Village. She noted that listening to other Design Review Board considerations there are very detailed and pointed questions, and that the same ought to be done with respect to this project.

Chair Kraehnke thanked Ms. Gordon-Fahn for her comments, and noted that while the Board does reserve the right to deny a project based on the design criteria, this was the third time the Board was seeing the proposal after previous discussions and revisions.

Ms. Andrea Brandt, 4054 N. Stowell Ave., stated that this project spans three different parcels, and to consider that the size is so great because it is taking up the area of three different properties.

Chair Kraehnke moved from public comments to Board discussion.

Mr. Brice stated that from an overall design perspective he was not happy with where the proposal is at. He noted that the developer had addressed previous concerns he brought up, but that more could be done to address the neighbor’s concerns. He noted that the Central District Master Plan did address scale and massing, and that it should be determined by the relationship to adjacent structures. He felt that additional details, elevations, and illustrations that show the relationship between this building/site and the neighborhood would be beneficial in guiding the Boards decision.

Mr. Brice also stated that he did not care for the false windows to screen the parking at the street level, and that changes could be made to make it more pedestrian friendly.

Chair Kraehnke noted that the zoning code allows the proposed window displays, and asked Mr. Brice if it is just a matter of him not liking them.

Mr. Brice answered stating that while they are allowed, that does not mean that there are not other available options, and that something else may lend itself to a more pedestrian friendly appearance; that it lacks activity.

Chair Kraehnke stated that the Board evaluates the designs that are brought to them, and weighs in on what if anything can be done to improve upon what has been presented, and because the owner of a property generally has an idea of what they want to do with the property, *significant* design changes seem out of place.

Mr. Koester stated he wanted to recognize the work that goes into projects before they get to the Design Review Board, the other Boards/volunteer members that make recommendations and approvals, elected officials, and Village staff. He noted that the Design Review Board did approve a very similar project in 2021 at the corner of Lake Bluff Blvd. and Oakland Ave., and in that case too it abuts a residential neighborhood. He recognized the changes that the developer had made upon the Boards request, and is in support of the current design.

Mr. Melzer acknowledged that he had reviewed the additional information provided by the neighborhood residents, and that their work was not in vain. He noted that he agreed with a number of the comments made by members of the neighborhood, and that additional green space would be appreciated.

Ms. Loest noted that the landscape plan had not received too much attention, and questioned the existing street trees that were proposed to be removed. Mr. Burris stated that there had been updates to the plans, and that all existing Village street trees would remain in place as is. Ms. Loest questioned the survivability of the proposed grass at the SE entrance of the building, and suggested that an alternative ground cover may be more appropriate. She noted that generally the variety of tall grasses that would remain throughout the winter in conjunction with different flowering plants the overall landscape plan would work nicely to provide year-round interest. She asked if there was a maintenance plan, if there was going to be irrigation or a manager on site to ensure upkeep of the landscaping.

Mr. Stanton answered that yes, there would be continual maintenance of the landscaping and that they had a landscape architect design their plan with local conditions in mind.

Ms. Loest noted that while there isn't the commercial activation she and many others would like to see, that the proposed landscape plan provides attractive visual interest, which is lacking in some of the other existing developments farther West down Capitol Dr.

Chair Kraehnke stated he appreciated the signage placeholder, and that it draws attention to the entrance. He appreciated the variation of the brick details on the West façade, and the parapet elevation changes. He noted that the manner in which the brick steps down, helps the building work into the adjacent neighborhood better with respect to massing.

Mr. O'Connor recognized the commentary from members of the neighborhood and community, and appreciated their passion. Through the design changes from his initial review, he believes that the perception of the mass of the building has been lessened. He noted the actual size of the building at four stories and the coverage of the lot had not been the issue for him. He felt there had been a lot of movement in the direction of reducing the appearance of mass, and that this building in its proposed location fits into the Village, and into this area on Capitol Dr.

Mr. Burris reminded Board members that in order for the Board to approve an application, it shall find and determine that the applicant's proposal is consistent with design criteria and will not contribute to substantial depreciation in the value of the applicant's property or neighboring properties.

Mr. Koester moved to approve the plans as submitted including that the applicant's proposal is consistent with design criteria and will not contribute to substantial depreciation in the value of the applicant's property or neighboring properties; seconded by Ms. Wright. Vote 6-3, Mr. Melzer nay, Mr. Pachefsky aye, Ms. Wright aye, Mr. Kraehnke aye, Mr. Skauge nay, Mr. Brice nay, Mr. Koester aye, Ms. Loest aye, Mr. O'Connor aye.

6. Further consideration of the application and plans on file for exterior modifications related to the removal of an auto service bay and expansion of the convenience store at commercial property 2521 E. Capitol Drive.

There was no one present to represent this item. The Board reviewed and discussed the amendments on the revised plans. It was noted that there are two parts to the plan, the building façade and the site plan. Revisions that had been requested have been made with respect to the façade of the building, however the site plan does not accurately represent the actual site conditions.

Mr. Skauge moved to approve the plans for the building as submitted, and not approve the site plan; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 9-0.

7. Adjournment

Mr. Koester moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:46 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Melzer. Vote 9-0.

Recorded by,



Justin Burris
Building Inspector